

have been allowing for 60 years, basically. We used to have a competitive environment prior to 1934. The country made a conscious decision at the time that we wanted a monopoly, both at the local and long-distance level. We changed the law in 1934. We created a monopoly arrangement. And, as I said, people, I think, would be hard pressed to argue against the statement that it has resulted in the United States having the best telecommunications system in the world. Though monopolies in general do not seem to work, this particular one did.

We made a good decision, although it was unpopular, in 1983 to divest. The divestiture has worked in the context of providing competition in the long-distance area. We now see rates have gone down. We see increased quality. We see improvement as a consequence of this competitive environment.

But, again, to be clear on this, all of us should understand the implications of the statement that in a competitive environment you cannot price your product below cost for very long. What that means is that if I have a residential line into my home and I am paying \$12 a month for that residential line and a business is paying \$30 a month for the very same thing, we cannot, as residential users, count on that for long. If the price and the cost to provide that residential service is \$14 or \$15, we are not going to be able to count for very long on being able to get that service for \$12. And many of our rural populations now enjoy \$4, \$5, \$6, \$7 a month for basic telephone service.

There are other issues that I think are terribly important for us to bring to this floor under the rules of the Senate, which allow unlimited debate. We need to have a debate. There is tremendous promise in telecommunications, promise for new jobs, particularly in a competitive environment, particularly from those entrepreneurs who are apt to create most of the new jobs. Those individuals who come in as small business people with a great new idea tend to be enormously innovative and competitive when it comes to pricing their good or service. I am excited about what competition is going to be able to do, not just for price and quality, but also for the creation of new jobs in the country.

There is tremendous promise, second, Mr. President, in our capacity to educate ourselves. I give a great deal of praise, again, to Senator PRESSLER and Senator BURNS and Senator ROCKEFELLER and others on the committee who put language in here to carve out special protection for our K-12 environment.

Some will say, why? If it is going to be market oriented, why would you do that? For the moment, at least, our schools are not market-oriented businesses. By that I mean they are government run. At \$240 billion a year, about 40 million students at \$6,000 apiece have to go to school for 180 days a year and learn whatever it is that the

States have decided they are supposed to learn. It is a government-run operation. And they are going to be unable, if property taxes and State sales and income taxes are the source of revenue, they are going to be unable to take advantage of this technology. So I was pleased we carved out provisions for schools in this legislation.

We are going to have to debate how do we get our institutions at the local level to change. It is not going to be enough for us merely to change the Federal regulation, giving them the legal authority to ask their local telephone company for a connect and to get a subsidized rate. There is a need for institutional change, both at the local level and at the State level. There is tremendous promise, in my judgment, in communication technology to help our schoolchildren and to help our people who are in the workplace to learn the things they need to know, not just to be able to raise their standard of living, but also to be able to function well as a citizen and to be able to get along with one another in their communities.

Finally, there is tremendous promise with communication technology in helping a citizen of this country become informed. When you are born in the United States of America or you become a citizen of the United States of America through the naturalization process, it is an extraordinary thing to consider. We are the freest people on Earth. No one really seriously doubts that. And the freedoms that we enjoy as a consequence of being a citizen are very exciting.

But balanced against that, a citizen of this country also has very difficult responsibilities. It is a hard thing to be a citizen, a hard thing. Pick up the newspaper, and if you read a newspaper cover to cover today, you have processed as much information in one single reading as was required in a lifetime in the 17th century. We are getting deluged with information. Suddenly a citizen needs to know where is Chechnya, for gosh sakes? What is the history of Haiti, for gosh sakes? All of a sudden I have to know things that I did not have to know before. To make an informed decision is not an easy thing to do. This technology offers us an opportunity to help that citizen, our citizens—ourselves included, I might add—make good decisions.

That will necessitate institutional change, I believe, at the Federal level, but also at the State level to get that done. This, along with education, along with jobs, and along with the changes that our people can expect to have happen, need a full and open and perhaps even lengthy debate on this floor before we enact what I consider to be a pretty darned good piece of legislation.

The committee finished the bill. They are fine tuning it now. They have not actually introduced it yet or given it a title. I am very appreciative of the fine work that Chairman PRESSLER has done and that Senator HOLLINGS and

other members of the committee have done to bring this legislation out. I consider it to be at least as important as many other things that we have debated thus far this year. Indeed, over the course of the next 10 years it is apt to be the most important thing that we do.

Therefore, I believe it is incumbent upon us not to just come here with an urgency to change the law, but it is incumbent upon us to come here and examine the law we propose to change and examine the details of the law as we propose to change them and engage the American people in a discussion of what these changes are going to mean for them.

Again, I have high praise for the committee and look forward and hope we have the opportunity to come to this floor for a good, open, and informative debate for the American people.

Mr. President, I yield the floor and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COVERDELL). Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE NOMINATION OF DAN GLICKMAN

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in a few moments we will be voting on confirmation of Dan Glickman to be Secretary of Agriculture. I compliment the President on his nomination for that position. I think that former Congressman Glickman is preeminently well qualified for that position.

I would like to say that I have known Dan Glickman since before he was born because we come from the same town, Wichita, KS. Actually we come from a number of towns; Wichita, KS and Philadelphia, PA. But at various times in my life I have lived in those places, and lived in Wichita. The Specter family and the Glickman family were friends for many, many years. In fact, my father, Harry Specter, was a business associate of Dan Glickman's grandfather, J. Glickman. Maybe that is too high an elevation. Actually, my father borrowed \$500 from J. Glickman in about 1936 or 1937 at the start of a junk business. In those days my dad would buy junk in the oil fields of Kansas and ship them in boxcars, and ship them through Glickman Iron and Metal. And J. Glickman got the override on the tonnage. So our family relationship goes back many, many years.

My family left Wichita in 1942, a couple of years before Dan Glickman was born. So that I like to say that I have known Dan since before he was born. But I have certainly have known him for his entire lifetime. I have a very, very high regard for him.

He had a very, very outstanding record as a Member of the House of Representatives from Wichita, KS. He has a very thorough grasp of the agriculture community and farm problems in America; a background that I share to some extent. Russell and Wichita and all of Kansas are in the wheat country, and as a teenager I drove a tractor in the farmland. It is quite an experience to drive a tractor in the harvest, round and round knocking down grain; pulling a combine, again, again, and again. It is a great incentive to become a lawyer, which I did after moving out of Kansas.

But beyond his professional qualifications and his experience, Dan Glickman is a great human being, compassionate, understanding, and will really be able to work with the problems of the American agriculture industry.

Still I think he has a keen eye for budget deficits and cost reductions to fit into the trend of the times as we try to move to balance the Federal budget for the target year 2002.

So I do not know that my colleagues will need too much urging because Dan has such an outstanding record and an outstanding reputation. But I wanted to add these few words in support of his nomination for Secretary of Agriculture.

I thank the Chair. I yield the floor.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair recognizes the Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Dan Glickman. I could not help but notice the Senator from Pennsylvania saying that he was driving a tractor and that encouraged him to become a lawyer. Well, I failed to become a lawyer.

But I rise to support the nomination of Dan Glickman as Secretary of Agriculture.

As the distinguished majority leader has indicated, Dan Glickman has an outstanding record on agricultural issues and I am certain that he will serve this Nation well as its Secretary of Agriculture.

As Secretary, I am optimistic that Mr. Glickman will take an even-handed approach to agricultural regulations. Recently, legislation has been introduced which is intended to provide special treatment for a limited class of poultry producers. I am referring to S. 600—the so-called Truth in Poultry Labeling Act of 1995. It is anything but truth in labeling.

This legislation is just one example of the pressures which may be brought to bear on the Department of Agriculture during Mr. Glickman's tenure as Secretary.

I am hopeful that he will not yield to special interests seeking preferential market treatment under the guise of antifraud legislation. If successful, S. 600 would result in significant economic harm to poultry producers across the Nation—so that a limited

class of local producers could achieve market dominance.

I hope that as Secretary, Mr. Glickman will send a clear signal that such tactics have no place in the rule-making procedures of the Department of Agriculture under his leadership or at any other time.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LUGAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

WAS CONGRESS IRRESPONSIBLE? THE VOTERS HAVE SAID YES

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, anyone even remotely familiar with the U.S. Constitution knows that no President can spend a dime of Federal tax money that has not first been authorized and appropriated by Congress—both the House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate.

So when you hear a politician or an editor or a commentator declare that "Reagan ran up the Federal debt" or that "Bush ran it up," bear in mind that the Founding Fathers, two centuries before the Reagan and Bush Presidencies, made it very clear that it is the constitutional duty of Congress to control Federal spending.

The fiscal irresponsibility of Congress has created a Federal debt which stood at \$4,851,857,494,143.63 as of the close of business Wednesday, March 29. Averaged out, every man, woman, and child in America owes a share of this massive debt, and that per capita share is \$18,417.06.

JOHN SILBER ON THE ARTS IN AMERICA

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, in a thoughtful article in the Boston Globe entitled "Funding the Arts Enriches the Nation," John Silber, president of Boston University, provides an eloquent reminder of the importance of the arts to the spirit of our Nation. President Silber effectively rebuts the negative myths about the National Endowment for the Arts and states the necessity and desirability of continued funding of the arts. NEA represents only one-half of 1 percent of the Federal budget. The program it funds and disseminates to neighborhoods and communities across America are eminently deserving of this moderate level of Federal support.

I commend this article to my colleagues and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Mar. 20, 1995]

FUNDING THE ARTS ENRICHES THE NATION

(By John Silber)

The 104th Congress has brought with it an open season on federal support for culture. Members of the congressional leadership have proposed defunding public broadcasting, and two former heads of the National Endowment for the Humanities testified that it ought to be terminated and advised the same fate for the National Endowment for the Arts.

The most common charge made against public broadcasting is bias toward the left, and those who would impose a death sentence on two endowments continually trot out the same horror stories.

With regard to the NEA, the cases in point are some items in an exhibit of Robert Mapplethorpe's photographs, an alleged work of art called "Piss Christ" by Andres Serrano and a piece of blood-spattered performance art by Ron Athey.

The NEH has subsidized a ludicrously tendentious set of standards for the teaching of history and has funded the Modern Language Association, the professional association of literary scholars, as it deconstructs into vulgarity and irrelevance.

These genuine horror stories are not so much the doing of the endowments as irrepressible eruptions of contemporary culture. It is very likely they would have occurred without government subsidy. We live, after all, in an age when John Cage was taken seriously as a composer.

But these are only the horror stories. The solid achievements of the endowments are ignored in favor of their few sensational mistakes.

The NEA has provided startup funds for a vigorous movement of regional theaters and enriched the musical life in the nation through the support of orchestras and other performance groups. The NEH has, among other activities, supported some of the most distinguished programs on public television, such as "Masterpiece Theatre" and "The Civil War."

Such successes have enriched the intellectual and artistic life of millions of Americans, and they have been far more influential than the comparatively few failures.

Nor is it true that PBS is, as a whole, a liberal enclave. There are, of course programs on PBS made from a liberal perspective and sometimes this perspective amounts to a bias that distorts reality. But PBS is also studded with programs produced from a conservative perspective.

And the great majority of PBS programs are about as free of ideology as is humanely possible. Consider one recent case, a history of the Cold War called "Messengers from Moscow." The final episode of the series was made up largely of interviews with Soviet politicians, bureaucrats and generals. Most of them agreed that the Soviet Union had been a fraud, and that the US challenge, orchestrated largely by Ronald Reagan, had brought the Soviet system down and made them see reality.

Jimmy Carter appeared as the man who first terrified the Soviets by considering the neutron bomb, and then was snookered into abandoning it by a massive propaganda assault. A Russian general explained that had the neutron bomb been deployed, the Soviet strategy of overwhelming NATO with tanks would have been rendered useless.

This politically incorrect program was produced by a PBS station with major funding from the NEH. It is representative of federally subsidized culture at its objective best, and it is impossible to imagine it on commercial television.